

The Times - Dispatch  
DAILY - WEEKLY - SUNDAY

Business Office: 912 E. Main Street  
Postage Paid: 1103 1/2  
Daily without Sunday: \$6.00  
Daily with Sunday: \$10.00  
Sunday edition only: \$1.00  
Weekly (Wednesday): \$1.00

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1939.

A LESSON IN CIVIC BEAUTY.

When it comes to city building, the West is usually ready to teach new lessons to the East and South. The Western town may have its origin in a mining camp or a dingy trading post at some bend in a river. But the moment it gains any civic consciousness, so to speak, it immediately begins to build boulevards, to lay out parks and to survey playgrounds.

Perhaps no Western city has done this more successfully than has Seattle. Twenty years ago the city straggled drearily along an unimproved peninsula, with no pretense at beauty. One day Seattle woke up. Now, according to the report of its Park Commission, it has a park area of 1,055 acres, valued at more than \$3,200,000. In addition, the city owns thirty-two acres of playgrounds, scattered conveniently throughout its confines. But Seattle's proposed new boulevard is perhaps of most interest to Richmond, since this city is considering the extension of its single boulevard and the parking of new streets in the West End. Seattle has heretofore rather neglected its outlying roads, and at present it has only some 60,000 feet of parked boulevard, extending along the shores of Lake Union and Lake Washington.

This, however, is only a beginning. The Seattle Park Commission has learned the all-important lesson that a boulevard cannot be useful unless it is extended through the city. The splendid example of Paris is being imitated on the Pacific. The Seattle commission has designed a boulevard, beginning at one end of the city, sweeping through its most important residential centers and connecting the many parks of the city with a chain of verdure. The boulevard is to be not less than seventy-five feet wide, and is to be parked throughout its length. A vast outlay is required to condemn the property along the line of the boulevard, and to improve the roadbed. But the city is not hesitating at this expense. It realizes that the increased value of property along the boulevard will, ere long, fully repay the city for the outlay.

Seattle is doing, at tremendous cost, for the whole city, what Richmond, at a small expense, could do at least for the western part of the city. Real estate owners in many cases would be only too glad to grant the city a free right-of-way through their property for a handsome boulevard. Adjoining land could be bought at a comparatively low figure, so that a boulevard worthy of the name could encircle Richmond's western suburbs.

Civic beauty is a municipal asset which never fails to pay large dividends. Stocks and bonds may decline, but the value of a boulevard or a park grows steadily with the years.

CLERICAL INSPECTORS AT THE FAIR.

The three clergymen who visited the State Fair to look for violation of the laws and help protect the public morals are, of course, coming in for some criticism both inside the State and out of it. Obviously, their action is somewhat inviting to the satirist, but for the most part this criticism is beside the mark and out of place. It is easy enough to say, as we find one contemporary saying, that if these gentlemen did not like the fair they were under no compulsion to visit it. But manifestly this does not approach the question from the proper angle.

Personally, we happen to think that there is little to gain yet awhile by searching for evil with a fine-tooth comb. Nor would we perhaps agree with the clergymen's committee as to what constitutes evil. Probably most of us could look at paint and powder by sunlight or even linger by the seductive canary birds with no consciousness that they were touching pitch. But points of view differ here, and the clergymen were entirely within their rights in believing and trying to show that these things were improper and illegal. Unless we conceive of them as men to whom the exercise of a little transitory authority is the dearest thing in the world, it is impossible to imagine that they enjoyed these supervisory activities. Of all men on earth, the self-constituted moral censor is the most unpopular. These gentlemen set out with the knowledge that their stern errand would do anything but endear them to the masses. We take it that a probably mistaken, but evidently strong sense of obligation to duty was their single mainspring.

There is no occasion for sarcasm here, which, heaven knows, is always easy and cheap enough. Men who do what they think they ought to do, at the known price of public ridicule, are not to be disposed of so easily. Instead, we may congratulate these gentlemen on their unflinching conscientiousness, while not necessarily envying them it, and so pass on to other matters.

WOMAN'S INEQUALITY AT LAW.

A clever and well-informed woman writing in Hampton's Magazine under

takes to tell us "What Eight Million Women Want." The title immediately arrests the masculine eye, since nothing that 8,000,000 women really want can possibly be viewed with indifference by any man. Instinctively the certainty comes to him, born of the known imperiousness of one woman's wants, that what millions of them desire they can have, whenever they choose to mobilize and take it. Consequently it is rather a relief to find that this particular thing is not the presidency—shall we ever hear it said, as an axiom, that "any American girl can be President?"—or an even split on the senatorships or the right to smoke cigars. It turns out to be only equality before the law. This may be only another way of spelling suffragetteism, but Rheta Childe Dorr has avoided that stormy word and neatly turned her point with never a mention of votes for women.

She makes, indeed, a good case. Intelligent, well-illustrated, and forceful, she tells of women whose husbands' creditors seized their (the women's) private businesses and furniture; of widows who had to buy back their own very business from their husbands' estates; of women's property submerged by the act of marriage to be disposed of in any way that a dishonest husband might see fit. She notes that in marriage, in many States, "husband and wife were one—and that one was the man." This is in an earlier age, but she finds that in seven States the property rights of women are "still denied." The prevalence of "desertion" shows that man's legal responsibility to support his family is often more nominal than enforceable.

A "woman's rights" map shows graphically how women have fared at the hands of lawmakers in various States. One State—Colorado—shows no inequalities, and is described as "little or the woman's paradise." Colorado women vote and are co-guardians of their children. Three other States give women the full vote; eight others and the District of Columbia have authorized co-guardianship of children. Twenty-one States show only "slight inequalities." Twenty States, including all the Southern States, give women "no control, or very slight control, of property or earnings." One State—Louisiana—is the worst of the lot, giving women "few rights." It is in black on the map. Virginia is specifically mentioned as closing its State university to women, as barring them from the practice of law and as requiring them to register as traders before they can control their own business property.

That female suffrage is not the necessary preliminary to removing inequalities at law is shown by the fact that many States which do not give women the vote are rated as favorably as two which do, and more favorably than one which does. Hence, this instructive article may not be suffragette propaganda in disguise after all. If it is not, it is safe to say that the march of the years is unmistakably on the side of Miss Dorr. The legal disabilities of women in the matter of property and earnings are disappearing from statute books, and will continue to disappear. They are reminiscences of a time when the sex, speaking largely, had no property and no earnings. The enormously increased economic importance of women has brought about entirely new conditions which lawmakers, soon or later, will certainly recognize.

NEGRO SCHOOLS AND NEGRO TAXPAYERS IN NORTH CAROLINA.

The statistical arguments of Charles L. Coon, Superintendent of Schools at Wilson, N. C., have brought some lively retorts down in the North State. Mr. Coon, it will be remembered, attempted to show that the negro schools of Virginia, North Carolina and Georgia were getting not far more, but actually less money than the race's contributions to the treasury entitled them to expect. As to Virginia, The Times-Dispatch has already shown that Mr. Coon established his point by a bit of bookkeeping which could not for a moment bear the light of day. This error straightened out, it appeared that Virginia negro schools were receiving, not less, but not far from double what any fair distribution on the basis of race lines would give them. Much the same demonstration has been made in North Carolina, where the Raleigh News and Observer has secured an official statement from State Superintendent of Schools J. Y. Joyner. The following sentence from the News and Observer sufficiently summarizes the findings:

"The investigation disclosed that the negroes in 1938 paid \$23,979.58 for schools, and that the total spent for negro education in the public schools was \$469,915.49.

An article in the Raleigh Farmer and Mechanic on the same theme is so instructive that it will bear quoting at greater length:

"When the statement is made that the total assessed property in North Carolina (real and personal) belonging to white people is \$416,683,472, and the total value of property of the colored people is \$21,252,581, together with the fact that the bulk of the school funds come from a tax on property in this State, the absurdity of Mr. Coon's statement must be seen by any fair-minded man. All property pays the same rate of taxation, and the proportion is 140 to 21 by negroes, so that on property the whites pay over twenty times as much for schools as the negroes. As to the corporation assessment of \$111,092,322, it is well known that 98 per cent at least is owned by the whites, who pay the taxes on it.

Mr. Coon's sensational argument, which unfailingly attracted the attention of the more jealous guardians of the black man at the North, is effectively disposed of so far as Virginia and North Carolina are concerned. There is no doubt that a little similar attention would do the same for it in Georgia.

The attendance at the fair yesterday, following the Big Day, offered the most gratifying assurance of the permanent

popularity of this great institution. If these two land-office days have cleared off all indebtedness and left the fair directors with a surplus for further improvements, or even for dividends, they are entitled to the heartiest congratulations. Nothing so far about this remarkably successful exposition deserves anything else but congratulations, with the exception of the whip nuisance, which deserves just the opposite. These little pests have swarmed in the crowds by thousands, and have made the Midway, particularly, objectionable to those who do not find rowdyism, even when good-natured, in any sense, an essential part of a jolly time. The police have moved vigorously and made almost countless arrests; but, of course, the whips should never have been sold in the first place, especially as we had exactly the same complaints last year. We trust that the fair management will do away with this annoyance another year by absolutely forbidding any vendor of whips to come inside the grounds.

The LL.D. which Harvard University has bestowed upon Dr. Edwin A. Alderman is a graceful and amply deserved tribute to the head of a seat of learning "to which," in President Lowell's words, "the country owes much and under his guidance will owe more." In a characteristically felicitous response Dr. Alderman drew attention to the tie that has existed from colonial days between Massachusetts and Virginia, and to the first contact between Harvard and the University of Virginia in George Ticknor's meeting with Jefferson. But there is evidently something else in the bestowal of this honorary degree, said to be the first conferred by Harvard upon a Southern educator within a generation, than an inter-Commonwealth or even inter-university compliment. There is acknowledgment in it not merely to Dr. Alderman the president of a great university, but to Dr. Alderman personally, the scholar and the gentleman. We find in the incident a happy public recognition of the fact that the head of the University of Virginia has become a national figure of consequence.

The greatest baseball match in the history of the game, from the standpoint of attendance and widespread interest, will be played at Pittsburg this afternoon. Doubtless the character of the sport, too, will be in keeping with the occasion, though it is one of the charms of baseball that the unexpected is constantly turning up. It is reported that \$100,000 in gate money has already been turned away, though the temporarily enlarged grounds will accommodate no less than 75,000 roaring fans. This not merely breaks, but utterly demolishes, all previous figures. A crowd of some 32,000 in last year's world's championship series was noted as a record-breaker. Such is the progress that the game has made in the hearts of the million within a twelve-month. The winners in the great duel which begins to-day will not only be hailed as the earth's champion ball-players, but will have to haul away their individual prize-money in drays.

Mark Twain's daughter married Oskip Garkowitch, a Russian pianist, yesterday, and Mark is invited to get a joke out of that if he can.

"Is the President serious?" asks a contemporary. He is. Born that way.

Explorer Baldwin, who declares that he is going to hunt the North Pole, apparently needs a guardian.

It is in no jocose spirit that we repeat the old catch to the effect that many a keen American boy would rather be Wright than President.

The Jacksonville Times-Union has an editorial on "The Manly Part of Hazing." Without pursuing it we venture the surmise that the manly part of hazing is not to do it.

Pennsylvania pulled off a Capitol crime without a single hanging.

In the interests of the womankind of the world, we wish to inquire if the walking and talking Alphonso is off managing the extermination of the Moors?

But very likely the New Jersey parson who asked for a lower salary stipend, as part of the bargain, that he should be given no pound parties and bedroom slippers.

Noting that Booth Tarkington has quit literature and become a high-grade agriculturalist, we hereby invite him to plant the King Corn contest at next year's State Fair.

ANOTHER CELEBRATION AFOOT.

Florida Would Commemorate Ponce de Leon's Discovery.

A movement is on foot, started in St. Augustine, for a celebration in that city of the four hundredth anniversary of the landing of Ponce de Leon. This should be made one of the most important celebrations in the nation's history. The event is the first in importance since the arrival of the first white man on territory now constituting the United States.

The youngest man who was with Ponce de Leon's party was dead long before any other settlements were made on the Atlantic coast of the United States. His landing was over ninety years prior to the settlement of Jamestown, and its centennial might have been celebrated before the city of St. Augustine was founded. Although St. Augustine was not founded until nearly fifty years later, that city was nearly as old as Jamestown when the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth.

The celebration, then, is that of laying the cornerstone of this sort of national and even of international importance. It is to be carried out, no time should be lost. The celebration would be in 1913, and it will take three and a half years' hard work to make it anything like the event that it should be.

Of course, St. Augustine is primarily interested in this matter, but Jacksonville is equally interested for such a celebration would lift St. Augustine and neighboring towns would be taxed to the utmost.

So we say to those who have the character in charge: Go to work, get your plans in shape, decide what you wish to do and then push on. We should certainly have a celebration, and we should make it worthy of the event.

Borrowed Jingles

SEVERAL OF A KIND.  
UNCLE.  
Uncle, whose inventive brains kept evolving airplanes, fell from an airplane (height) on my garden lawn last night. Plying is a fatal sport. Uncle wrecked the tennis court.

MABEL.  
Mabel's chronic inflammation of the throat (throat) was cured. Oh, her cries were loud and deep! I could scarcely get to sleep.

INCONVENIENCE.  
I collided with some trippers. In my swift De Dion Bouton, I sent them out as fast as kippers. Left them "dazed, more, quite motionless." What a nuisance trippers are! I must now repaint the car.

WASTE.  
I had written to Aunt Maud. Who was on a trip abroad. When I heard she'd died of cramp, just too late to save the stamp. —London Punch.

MEREY JOKING.

A Rialto View.  
"Do you think a little Shakespeare would go as a vaudeville act?" inquired Hamlet Patti.  
"Any act?" responded Yorick Hamlet.  
"Everybody feels that they're not good for it if it comes alone. No man is going to admit that Shakespeare is over his head." —Washington Herald.

When Things Go Wrong.  
"I've been looking into this optometrist business a little."  
"Well?"  
"It is necessary to keep a smiling when you are alone." —Pittsburg Post.

The Auto Courtship.  
What qualifications as a son-in-law has he obtained? "What do you see in this fellow, hey?"  
"He is such a showy travel driver. But marriage is a reliability run." —Houston Chronicle.

The Latest.  
"What is the latest in this Arctic controversy?"  
"As we went to press," replied the editor, "one gentleman is reported to have remarked: 'Puff!'"

"You don't say?"  
"Yes," with which the other gentleman is alleged to have responded. "Burr!" —Louisville Courier-Journal.

Modern Accessories.  
"I wish to buy a cheap camera."  
"Here you are, sir. We got some plates!"  
"With pens as high as applying this to be smashed by the groom at a fashionable wedding." —Kansas City Journal.

No Flattery Intended.  
"Tim: 'Would you scream if I kissed you?'"  
"I suppose you flatter yourself that I'd be speechless with joy!" —Mobile Register.

THE OBSERVANT PARAGRAPHERS.

THERE may be a Jeffries-Johnson fight, but the Bryan-Bailey affair will necessarily have to wait for an even more oratorical preliminary. —Cleveland Leader.

A New Orleans man laughed so hard a few days ago that he died before he could get his face straight, and the cause was on the joke. —Memphis News-Sentinel.

Professor Metchnikoff says we may live as long as Methuselah, but we'll never attempt to do so as he is at present. —Atlanta Constitution.

Pearl and Ballinger! Wouldn't the combination create a cold wave wherever it went? —Savannah Press.

We judge from the arguments pro and con which led to the proposal of constitutional prohibition for Alabama that it is seriously affecting the digestive organs of many erstwhile happy citizens. —Washington Herald.

If they ever get started cutting up States to settle quarrels, there may be a time when the stars will be crowded off the flag. Texas is said to be large enough to make about 20 Rhode Islands. —Columbia State.

SEA DOGS STUDYING LAW.

Captain Seably, of the Republic, Mastering Subject That Concerns His Own Standing.

The captain who loses his ship is likely to wait a long time before he gets another, even if investigation shows that he was not to blame. If he is censured, he may as well hunt another job. Captain Inman Seably, who was in command of the White Star Line steamer Republic, that went down in January following a collision with the Florida, may or may not lose his papers. That will depend upon the finding of the admiralty court. In the meantime he will be busy. He has just entered the University of Michigan as a freshman in the law school, and will make a specialty of admiralty law. It is possible that the question of responsibility for the loss of the Republic may require a long time for settlement. Already there has been much litigation, and it was this that first made Captain Seably think about preparing to earn a living in admiralty practice. There is much law business of this sort in Detroit, and Ann Arbor, where he is attending lectures, is near Detroit. On the practical side, he will have some advantage over most admiralty lawyers at the start. He knows the ocean and the ships as few land-lubbers, no matter how learned they may be in the law of the sea, know them. He is a sea dog. One of his first commands in 1897. He is a commander in the royal naval reserve and still draws half pay as an employee of the White Star Line.

Captain Seably will have as a fellow-student at Ann Arbor Captain Irving Evans, who resigned the command of a sloop to enter the law school. Captain Evans was a first-class lawyer, too, and will graduate next June. —Hartford Courier.

Kern Will Stick to Law.

John W. Kern, of Indiana—think a minute and you will remember him—explained to a jury the other day why he is still practicing law. In 1900, he says, "the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided that I should still practice law. In 1904 the same question was again submitted to me, and by a majority vote I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1908, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1912, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1916, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1920, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1924, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1928, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1932, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1936, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1940, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1944, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1948, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1952, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1956, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1960, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1964, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1968, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1972, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1976, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1980, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1984, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1988, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1992, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 1996, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2000, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2004, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2008, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2012, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2016, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2020, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2024, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2028, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2032, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2036, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2040, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2044, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2048, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2052, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2056, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2060, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2064, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2068, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2072, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2076, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2080, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2084, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2088, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2092, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2096, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2100, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2104, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2108, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2112, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2116, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2120, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2124, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2128, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2132, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2136, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2140, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2144, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2148, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2152, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2156, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2160, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2164, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2168, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2172, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2176, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2180, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2184, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2188, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2192, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2196, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2200, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2204, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2208, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2212, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2216, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2220, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2224, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2228, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2232, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2236, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2240, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2244, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2248, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2252, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2256, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2260, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2264, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2268, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2272, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2276, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2280, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2284, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2288, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2292, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2296, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2300, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2304, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2308, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2312, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2316, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2320, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2324, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2328, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2332, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2336, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2340, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2344, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2348, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2352, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2356, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2360, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2364, the question was, 'to whether I should continue to practice law or submit to the people of Indiana.' I decided to continue to practice law. I should continue to practice law. But, in 2368, the question was, 'to whether